

**REVIEW OF UNIFORM FENCING POLICY 3.1.6  
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS FOLLOWING ADVERTISING  
(CLOSED 26 DECEMBER 2002)**

| <b>NO</b> | <b>NAME OF SUBMITTOR</b> | <b>DESCRIPTION OF AFFECTED PROPERTY</b>      | <b>SUBMISSION SUMMARY</b>  | <b>COUNCIL'S RECOMMENDATION</b>   |
|-----------|--------------------------|--|--|---|
| 1         | P Brown                  | 2 Christchurch Terrace<br>CURRAMBINE WA 6028 | <p>It would be appropriate to address the matter of replacement fencing where current fencing is not constructed of permanent materials (refers to the suburb of Currambine whereby limestone piers and timber infill panels are used). Requests that the City consider incorporating into the reviewed policy provisions relating to alternative replacement fencing being considered (i.e. masonry construction).</p> <p>Suggested that the City should set a higher standard of estate fencing than that offered under the current policy.</p> <p>Suggests Council should contribute to the cost of replacement fencing whereby such fencing is falling into disrepair.</p> | <p>This issue is not being sought to be included within the policy, as it is already adequately covered under the City's Private Property Local Law 1998, whereby there is sufficient scope under the local law to consider applications for replacement fencing that does not match that already erected.</p> <p>This issue has been addressed and is the main intention of the revised policy.</p> <p>The landowner is responsible for all replacement fencing costs.</p> |